In the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan
At
Jaipur Bench, Jaipur

O R D E R

In

S.B. Criminal Misc. Bail Application No.7231/06
Harmanu Singh @ Mannu Vs. State of Rajasthan

Date Of Order :: 27th November, 2006

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Ray Goyal

Mr. Prahlad Sharma, counsel for petitioner.
Mr. R.P. Kuldeep, Public Prosecutor for State.

.....

This transitory anticipatory bail application under section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure has been filed by the accused petitioner Harmanu Singh @ Mannu in regard to FIR No.32/2006 registered at Police Station Balyawale, District Bhatinda (Punjab) for the offence under sections 420, 406 & 120B IPC.

Heard learned counsel for accused petitioner, learned Prosecutor for the State and perused the material produced during the course of arguments.

It is contended on behalf of the accused petitioner that he is an innocent person, he has not committed any offence, he is a resident of plot No.E-184, Ambabari, Jaipur whereas the FIR in question has been lodged in the State of Punjab and in order to take suitable steps in regard to his bail in the State of Punjab a request has been made for transitory anticipatory bail for a limited

period since he is apprehending his arrest in this matter as some persons from Punjab Police came to apprehend him on 14/9/2006 and thereafter on 23/10/2006 in this matter. Reliance has been placed on the order dated 30/5/2005 passed by a coordinate bench of this Court in **S.B. Criminal Misc. Bail Application No.2686/2005** titled as **Smt. Jyoti Sharma Vs. State.**

Learned Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed this transitory anticipatory bail application and contended that the petitioner is the principal accused who extracted lacks of rupees from the complainants by deceitful means, alluring them to send USA for employment. It is also submitted that according to the FIR referred by petitioner there is specific allegation against the petitioner for receiving Rs.7,00,000/- at his residence in Jaipur.

Without making any observation on merits, having considered the rival submissions made at the bar and all other facts and circumstances including the nature of allegations levelled against the accused petitioner, I do not deem it proper to grant the benefit of transitory anticipatory bail to accused petitioner Harmanu Singh @ Mannu. The same is rejected accordingly.

(J.R. Goyal),J

VS Shekhawat/-
Jr. P.A.